

Abgrund, ein Traktat über die Logik der Menschenschaft / Abgrund, a tractatus about the logic of people-ness

§-1 - Changelog

- Begriffe have been recycled
- I wanted to merge the meaning of property, proposition, entity to build a system for Xanadux2
- Post-human thoughts are abandoned, I'm getting old

§0

For **nomenclature** do not think about the word's meaning but more of its conceptual use. The word's meaning evolves in its relation with other meanings in the system.

§1

This is **about** the system called Abgrund $System\{Abgrund(\cdot)\}$ as re-expression of the author's thoughts.

Goal{*formalize a system for expressing thoughts*} (1.1.)

Thesis{*any aussage can be expressed with Abgrund*} (1.2.)

§2 - expression

The following is a $\lim \rightarrow 0$ weak proof: *Proof*{

Any description about reality *perception* remains informative even fictional. Normative descriptions *norms* only apply to subjects derived from people's thoughts such as laws of nature and ethics, nature sciences and other forms of communication. Everything expressed is assumed to be true
 $aussage = \text{true}$ unless expressed otherwise $naussage$ or $n(aussage)$.

When some thing B is expressed then some other thing *hidden* H not expressed.

$Expression\{B\} \implies Assumption\{B\ H\}$ (2.)

Read 'the expression (of) B implies the assumption (of) B and H '

§3

'Dog' is an expression. Expressions hold several **aussagen**.

$$Expression(Aussage\ Aussage\ \dots) \quad (3.1.)$$

Unlike expressions aussagen do not have a truth value. An Aussage 'is black' can not be expressed without making it an expression.

$$ant.\ black \quad (3.2.)$$

§4

We will refer to 'expressions' or 'aussagen' as '**entity**' E .

§5

Entities are written as a sequence of characters *concatenation* the **identification** $i()$. A space ' ' divides concatenations. Parenthesis () and similar do the exception.

§6 - order

Common use of left-to-right practice.

§7

Aussagen are attributed implicitly through grouping $E(\alpha)$ or explicit **attribution** $E.\alpha$. Attributes do not change the base entity; they only refine the expressed.

§8

An expression is bound to and part of a **view** V of some agent - it is *presented*. All views combined are a non-expressible *world*. Aussagen are agent independent.

§9

If an agent where to express nothing then its view would be without **statement**. An agent restricts aussagen through rules and permits aussagen by allowing rights *normativity*. With each distinct statement the view changes. Every statement is an expression conditioned by moral/bias/neurofunction.

§10

We will not try to express more about aussagen, so entity will only refer to expression. Nouns are entities. Expressing a noun expresses it as an **instance** Z .

§11

An instance is bound to and part of a **process** Y . (No need for sequence of instances.)

§12

A process is bound to and part of a **relation** X . Instances relate to processes like processes relate to relations. And so do relations to whatever relates to them next in line. We will call all these entities relations

because similarly to an aussage expressing a single entity holds no value without having anything to compare it with. Instead of having to express two entities we only need to express one relation. It can be decomposed into difference and reference.

§13

Expressing distinct entities also expresses indirectly their **difference** Δ (conventionally through neuro-function by agent). The difference without a reference is not expressible.

$$1Z - 2Z \wedge 2Z - 1Z =: Y(1Z \ 2Z)$$

§14 - formerly relation's kind

The difference between entities may change depending on the order in which the components are expressed. **Reference** \mathcal{R} is the logical combination of those components.

$$\text{Example}\{mono - (5 \ 4) = 1 \neq dual - (5 \ 4) = \{1, -1\}\} \quad (14.)$$

§15

These relations are necessarily associative and may be also thought of as '**group**' (mathematics). Unlike values, meanings may have any graph structure relating (that's what graphs are made for). Difference and References each can be unified and separated which is why also relations do so.

§16

An expression expresses meaning but not how it comes to that meaning. **Meta order** M is applied to relations X^M to explain X's meaning. As with order, how relations relate differs with meta order.

$$\text{Example}\{2 + 3 = 5 \neq 2 +^2 3 = 6 \neq 2 +^3 3 = 8\} \quad (16.1.)$$

One may invoke a new order by relating two old orders.

$$X(E^M \ E^M) = E^{M+1} \quad (16.2.)$$

Instances Z are M=0, Y:=M=1, X:=M=2

§17

For some given relations that have at least one component in common are said to be conceptually the same if the relations mean the same.

$$\text{Concept} := (A \ B) = (A \ C) \quad (17.)$$

The meaning (or programming code) called the **concept** is referenced by

other relations of different identifications.

§18

An **ideal** relation is one which holds its concept's meaning even if the components are refined. By convention all relations expressed using identities (non-variables) are ideal.

§19

If exactly one outcome of a relation is possible then the relation holds. If the expression is not sufficient then some part of the relation may hold. If the expression is not **sufficient** and not **satisfactory** then it does not hold. The relation of an only satisfied expression is called a field F . Relation will continue to refer to a 'choice' of a sufficient expression.

§20

Expressing is goal-oriented. By expressing aussagen their meaning refines towards an **objective**, idealized meaning.

§21 - influence

In a list of entities to express refinement toward the objective there exists non-influential *affective* or influential *effective* expressions I . Effectiveness is sufficiency.

$$E I \rightarrow Objective \quad (21.)$$

§21

How the influence relates is called **method**. It is of higher meta order than the influence (the current meaning). A known method can become a concept.

§22

Influence on one component acts as a statement which is why the other components must be **refined** (because they are ruled over / given rights). This is due to compatibility or statements like Abgrund. Relations are then added, removed or adjusted.

§23

Compatibility is the state of harmonized statements - or the need to constantly refine expressions to fit a view and the view the perception.

§24

Aussagen with strong influence are called *prerequisites*. They become the view's base aussagen that are unlikely to be re-refined because that would lead to great incompatibility. It is more likely so that weak influence will be refined. This method is called **_logic-bias_**.

§25

For a view a list of prerequisites is a **paradigm**. Aussagen to be refined made based on a paradigm belong to the agent's *experience*. Statements of a paradigm are *laws*.

§26

Experiences are expressed through lists of expressions. Each list is a *representation*. **Layers** form a paradigm and an experience inside an experience. Statements of an experience are *norms*.

§27

A representation that should reflect a view is a **virtualization**.

§28

Unlike virtualizations like Abgrund presentations need to be expressed in a matrix of relations where each rows represents an instance of the view or world. As a formalism: a list of relations is a **situational instance** of an agent W_V .

§29

*LifeIs_Black is a relation for a particular view_trope or T-based. We write each view of the LifeIs_Black relation on a different row. But across different views (in its specified column) we must call this particular relation an aussage or **property** U or U-based.*

§30

*Relating views gives a society S (public opinion). Views adjust to each other according to a number of relating factors. **Adjustment** is refinement towards an experience.*

§31

So we have T-based entities as views and with meta order. Equivalently U-based entities that are universal and currently no defined meta order.

Lets express the world using this single matrix:

We should be able to agree that a T-instance of T-meta order =0 is the same as U-instance - the instance only relates to itself no matter if by view or by universal.

Now off a (U-)property instances are created. This means that properties could be assigned a T-meta order of $M=-1$ or a U-meta order of $M=1$. Or to sum it up universal properties form instances the same way that those form processes Y. Doing an inverse relation of an instance gives properties.

§32

Further doing inverse relations (U-based) with properties creates another infinite regression of (inverse) relations / entities. We can virtually find methods and explain all entities if we wanted in theory.

§33

*What if there existed another factor besides universal U and view-dependent T that would make our matrix n-dimensional? Let us call each factor a **perspective** P. Then our T becomes P1 and U P2, the third perspective P3 and so on.*

End_of_Proof}

§5.2

Identification is independent of _actual meaning or concept. Thus many names exist nowadays for the very same process even though they are the same (but differ in domain applied). To express relations its components id becomes obsolete, therefore we may as well use variables in examples.

§last

Ad: Iffy is Abgrund's presentation applied. Need: matrix of knowledge relating. Gives: 1. automation of *workflows* for data in matrix. 2. *Conceptual relation optimization* / knowledge completion. 3. *Complexity reduction* because only basic relation are needed for representation of knowledge - no need for large formulas: in matrix all entities can be looked up. 4. *Lateral optimization* by finding shorter output paths.

Sidenote: Iffy unter Gesellschaftslehreaspekten betrachtet

Iffy regulation ist selbst nicht dynamisch oder anpassungsfähig, es ist spezialisiert auf das Ökosystem, in dem es eingesetzt wird. Bei dramatischen Ereignissen fällt erst auf, dass Iffys (statements) nicht ausreichen, um mit der Umwelt umzugehen. Infolgedessen werden neue Iffys erlassen um im fall von x dann y. Das ist momentan höllisch zeitintensiv (die Regulation) und beschäftigt mehr menschen, als es tatsächlich betrifft. Diese Befugnis die Regulation durchzuführen zu dezentralisieren bedeutete wohl eine schnellere Anpassungsfähigkeit und noch weniger Transparenz im System. Diese Intransparenz könnte zwar durch transparency (byung chul han) also Digitalisierung ausgeglichen werden, führte aber wahrscheinlich zu keiner Verbesserung der Entscheidungsfähigkeit (mit gutem/verbessertem Gewissen entscheiden zu können) des Einzelnen. Das Individuum muss sich so oder so seiner Gesellschaft beugen und hätte nur in seinem Fach eine minimale Entscheidungsbefähigung bei einer dezentralen Regulation. Bei einer nicht regulativ kontrollierten Gesellschaft müsste er über alles entscheiden und müsste sich wohl möglich jedes mal einen Rat holen, weil andere damit Erfahrung gemacht haben. Dies führte automatisch aber wieder zu mehr oder weniger gemeinsamen Moralvorstellungen und dem Ausdruck dieser

in Standards und Gesetzen (also statements). Es ist aber zumindest manuell anpassungsfähig auf neue Gegebenheiten. Wenn wir uns also gemeinsam all unserer Regularien entledigten und von Neuem begännen diese zu entscheiden/einzurichten, dann könnten wir uns an allen gegebenen Umständen nach einiger Zeit anpassen. Es wäre eine Möglichkeit gewesen den Klimawandel und kommende Schäden zu verhindern, wenn man damit vor 10 Jahren begonnen hätte und die Moral nicht in den Menschen so sehr verankert wäre. Aber hier sind wir nun, angepasst an ein System, das so nicht mehr lange funktioniert. Äußere Einflüsse werden zu einer gesellschaftlichem Apokalypse führen (und gerade weil wir so denken), die uns zwingen wird so gut wie alle momentan bestehenden Regularien aufzubrechen, um den Umständen gegensteuern zu können; unsere Regularienansichten so sehr zu verändern, dass wir mit unseren dann zu treffenden Entscheidungen leben können (hoffentlich und necessarily guten Gewissens).

§license

Kopimi and refine!